

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/368,354

Applicant(s)

BUCKLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) John Fitzpatrick.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Proposed arguments

Claim(s) discussed: 1 4 10

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed how Bloomberg differs from the claimed invention. Particulars in that Bloomberg fails to teach of "overmarking processing" in the sense of the well-known definition. The examiner will reconsider the rejection in the previous office action.